

1 ANDREW S. CLARE (SBN 050289)  
aclare@loeb.com  
2 MARK D. CAMPBELL (SBN 180528)  
mcampbell@loeb.com  
3 DAVID GROSSMAN (SBN 211326)  
dgrossman@loeb.com  
4 W. ALLAN EDMISTON (SBN 228246)  
aedmiston@loeb.com  
5 LOEB & LOEB LLP  
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 2200  
6 Los Angeles, California 90067-4120  
Telephone: 310-282-2000  
7 Facsimile: 310-282-2200

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
POM WONDERFUL LLC  
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12  
13

14 POM WONDERFUL LLC, a Delaware  
limited liability company,

15 Plaintiff,  
16

17 v.

18 THE COCA-COLA COMPANY, a  
Delaware corporation; and DOES 1-10,  
19 inclusive,

20 Defendants.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No. CV08-06237 SJO (JTLx)

**NOTICE OF SUBSEQUENT  
AUTHORITY IN OPPOSITION TO  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO  
DISMISS PURSUANT TO FED. R.  
CIV. P. 12(b)(6) OR, IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, REQUEST FOR  
LEAVE TO LODGE SUBSEQUENT  
AUTHORITY**

Judge: Hon. S. James Otero

Date: January 5, 2009

Time: 10:00 am

Room: 880

NOTICE OF SUBSEQUENT AUTHORITY  
IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS  
Case No. CV08-06237 SJO (JTLx)

1           **TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF**  
 2 **RECORD:**

3           **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that plaintiff Pom Wonderful LLC (“Pom  
 4 Wonderful”), through its undersigned counsel, hereby provides notice of a recent  
 5 decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit that is material  
 6 to the issues raised by Pom Wonderful in its opposition to The Coca-Cola  
 7 Company’s (“Defendant’s”) Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil  
 8 Procedure 12(b)(6) (the “Motion to Dismiss”). (Docket No. 11.)

9           Alternatively, should leave of Court be necessary to lodge this Ninth Circuit  
 10 decision with the Court, Pom Wonderful respectfully requests that the Court enter  
 11 an Order granting Pom Wonderful the required leave.

12           In support hereof, Pom Wonderful represents as follows:

13           1.     On December 15, 2008, Pom Wonderful LLC filed and served its  
 14 opposition to the Motion to Dismiss. (Docket No. 11.)

15           2.     One week later, on December 22, 2008, the Ninth Circuit entered an  
 16 Order Denying Petition for Rehearing En Banc and Amending Opinion and  
 17 Amended Opinion (the “Order”) in a deceptive labeling case entitled Williams v.  
 18 Gerber Prods. Co., Case No. 06-55921 (Dec. 22, 2008). A true and correct copy of  
 19 the Order is attached hereto as Exhibit “A.”

20           3.     In the Order, the Ninth Circuit declined to consider whether the  
 21 plaintiffs’ state law unfair competition claims, based on allegations of deceptive  
 22 fruit snack labeling, were preempted by the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetics Act  
 23 (the “FDCA”). It reasoned: “[W]e decline to decide this issue in the first instance  
 24 based on arguments made in an answering brief, particularly where nothing in  
 25 Appellants’ complaint suggested that they were attempting to directly enforce  
 26 violations of the FDCA.” (Ex. A., p. 16636.)

1           4.       Instead, applying the “reasonable consumer” test, the Ninth Circuit  
 2 considered whether an accurate side-panel ingredient list may insulate a fruit snack  
 3 manufacturer from liability for otherwise “misleading representations on the front of  
 4 the box.” (Ex. A., p. 16639.) It held:

5           The district court suggests that ‘no reasonable consumer upon review  
 6 of the package as a whole would conclude that Snacks contains juice  
 7 from actual and fruit-like substances displayed on the packaging  
 8 particularly where the ingredients are specifically identified.’  
 9 *Williams*, 439 F.Supp.2d at 1116. *We disagree with the district court*  
 10 *that reasonable consumers should be expected to look beyond*  
 11 *misleading representations on the front of the box to discover the truth*  
 12 *from the ingredient list in small print on the side of the box.* The  
 13 ingredient list on the side of the box appears to comply with FDA  
 14 regulations and certainly serves some purpose. *We do not think that*  
 15 *the FDA requires an ingredient list so that manufacturers can mislead*  
 16 *consumers and then rely on the ingredient list to correct those*  
 17 *misinterpretations and provide a shield for liability for the deception.*  
 18 Instead, reasonable consumers expect that the ingredient list contains  
 19 more detailed information about the product that confirms other  
 20 representations on the packaging.

21 (Ex. A, p. 16639) (emphases added).

22 /////

23 /////

24 /////

25 /////

26 /////

27 /////

28

1 Based on the foregoing, should leave of Court be necessary to lodge the Order  
2 with the Court, Pom Wonderful respectfully requests that the Court grant the  
3 required leave.

4 Dated: December 29, 2008

LOEB & LOEB LLP  
ANDREW S. CLARE  
MARK D. CAMPBELL  
DAVID GROSSMAN  
W. ALLAN EDMISTON

8 By: /s/ Mark D. Campbell  
9 MARK D. CAMPBELL  
10 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF  
11 POM WONDERFUL LLC  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28